



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/597,358

08/30/2006

Gay Joyce Cornelius

102792-602 (11401P1 US)

9852

27389 7590 07/23/2008  
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS  
875 THIRD AVE  
18TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ASDJODI, MOHAMMAD REZA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/597,358	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CORNELIUS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MOHAMMAD R. ASDJODI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/21/06</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

*The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:*

***A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –  
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.***

Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by De Guertechin (US 5, 527,486).

Regarding claims 1-6, and 18, De Guertechin teaches a near tri-critical point cleaning compositions comprising: water, as polar solvent, by the amount of 55-95% and also 97%; [6: 24-26, 5: 17-27], amphiphilic agents, such as alkylene glycol alkyl ethers wherein R<sup>1</sup> is a C<sub>4</sub>- C<sub>8</sub>, and n is 1 to 5, by the amount of 1-23%; [5: 21-23], and non-polar hydrocarbons with more than five carbon atoms (octylactate) by the amounts of 2-10%; [7: 2, 5: 20], wherein the composition is in a single phase; [5: 55-60].

Regarding claims 11, 12, and 14, De Guertechin teaches a method of cleaning soiled substrates such as household materials; [3: 36], wherein the composition is in the form of two or three phases in equilibrium; [5: 55-60].

Regarding claims 17, and 19, De Guertechin teaches a cleaning composition comprising short chain hydrocarbon such as isopropanol, electrolytes, and perfume; [10: 45, 46, 62].

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

*The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:*

***(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.***

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9, and 20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Guertechin (US 5,527,486), as applied to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 9, on the amount of hydrocarbon (0.05-0.5): “a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected [the claimed product and a product disclosed in the prior art] to have the same properties.” *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). [MPEP 2131.03, R6].

Regarding claim 20, De Guertechin teaches the basic cleaning composition as set forth for claim 1 above.

De Guertechin does not explicitly teach the self-induced motility (which is more relevant in study of micro-organisms) of this three component system in equilibrium. The Office realizes that all the claimed effects or physical properties, such as self induced motility, are not positively stated by the reference (or: References). However, the reference teaches all of the claimed reagents, and their equilibrium states specifically. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties (self-induced motility due to differences in volatility and vapor pressure of different components) would implicitly be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be presented to support applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 10, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Guertechin (US 5, 527,486).

Regarding claim 10, De Guertechin teaches a near tri-critical point (abstract) cleaning compositions comprising: water, as polar solvent; [6: 24-26], amphiphilic agents; [5: 21-23], and non-polar hydrocarbons; [7: 2, 5: 20].

De Guertechin does not teach maragoni effect (or self-induced motility) in his composition. Gibbs-maragoni effect (e.g. tears of wine) is caused by factors such as concentration gradient, temperature gradient, density of cumulative and simultaneous

combination of these effects. Considering the composition being able to exist in three phases, the maragoni effect is a direct consequence of physio-chemical property of the system. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be presented to support applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects with only the claimed ingredients.

Claims 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Guertechin (US 5,527,486), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Hachmann et al. (US 5,646,105)

Regarding claims 7, and 8, De Guertechin teaches the basic cleaning composition as set forth for claim 1 above.

De Guertechin does not, explicitly, teach amphophiles such as methyl 2-pyrrolidone and glycol ether of claim 6, where R<sup>1</sup> is a phenyl group. However, Hachmann et al. teach a cleaning composition comprising methyl 2-pyrrolidone and 1-phenoxy propanol; [4: Table, 1: 47]. Hachmann et al. and De Guertechin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavour, that of cleaning compositions. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hachmann's amphophiles such as methyl 2-pyrrolidone and 1-phenoxy propanol with De Guertechin's composition with the motivation of dissolving the soils as taught by Hachmann et al.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Guertechin (US 5, 527,486), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Iaia et al. (US 5,499,748).

Regarding claim 13, De Guertechin teaches the basic cleaning composition as set forth for claim 1 above.

De Guertechin does not teach a package associated with his cleaning composition. However, Iaia et al. teach a cleaning composition being delivered in a package (page 1]. Iaia et al. and De Guertechin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavour that of cleaning compositions and their packaging. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use packaging of Iaia et al. for composition of De Guertechin with the motivation of proper disposing of compound for the comfort of consumers.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Guertechin (US 5,527,486), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Vermeer (US 5,624,906).

Regarding claim 15, De Guertechin teaches the basic cleaning composition as set forth for claim 1 above.

De Guertechin does not teach alkylaldonamide in his cleaning composition. However, Vermeer teaches a hygienic cleaning composition comprising: alkylaldonamide; [2: 38]. Vermeer and De Guertechin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavour that of cleaning compositions. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use

alkylaldonamide of Vermeer in composition of De Guertechin with the motivation of improved foaming, viscosity and clarity of cleaning composition as evidenced by Vermeer.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Guertechin (US 5,527,486), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Johansson (US 5,64,041).

Regarding claim 16, De Guertechin teaches the basic cleaning composition as set forth for claim 1 above.

De Guertechin does not teach alkyl glucoside (ten or less carbon atoms) in his cleaning composition. However, Johansson teaches a cleaning composition comprising alkyl glucoside of instant claim; [4: 19]. Johansson and De Guertechin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavour that of cleaning compositions. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use alkyl glucoside of Johansson in composition of De Guertechin with the motivation of improved cleaning properties on hard surfaces as taught by Johansson.

### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. M. Reza Asdjodi whose telephone number is (571)270-3295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00 EST.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MARK EASHOO, Ph.D./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
21-Jul-08

/M. R. A./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
07/19/08